

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                   | FILING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.             | CONFIRMATION NO |  |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 09/856,341                        | 08/27/2001     | Markus Beier         | 03528.0131.P                    | 6855            |  |
| 7590 10/28/2004                   |                | EXAMINER             |                                 |                 |  |
| Albert P Halluin                  |                |                      | FLETCHER III. WILLIAM P         |                 |  |
|                                   | Arnold & White |                      | ·                               |                 |  |
| 301 Ravenswood Avenue             |                |                      | ART UNIT                        | PAPER NUMBER    |  |
| Box No 34<br>Menlo Park, CA 94025 |                |                      | 1762<br>DATE MAILED: 10/28-2004 |                 |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.  | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action   | 09/856,341   | BEIER, MARKUS   |  |  |  |  |  |
| rationy riodon  | Examiner   | Art Unit  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | William P. Fletcher III  | 1762  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 08 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.  | oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which   | ition. A proper reply to  | o a<br>on in   |  |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR RE   | PLY [check either a) or b)]  | -   | ,  |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C   | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFI f extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail | g date of the final rejection<br>IE FINAL REJECTION. Se<br>R 1.136(a) and the appropi<br>unt of the fee. The approporiginally set in the final Of | n. ee MPEP riate extension priate extension ffice action; or |  |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2 \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be  | cause:   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| (a) X they raise new issues that would require further  | er consideration and/or search (s  | see NOTE below);  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be  | elow);   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in<br/>issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>  | better form for appeal by mater  | rially reducing or simp   | lifying the  |  |  |  |  |
| (d)  they present additional claims without canceling   | ng a corresponding number of fir   | nally rejected claims.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| $3  \boxtimes $ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti  | on(s): See Continuation Sheet.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would l canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   | be allowable if submitted in a se  | parate, timely filed am   | nendment   |  |  |  |  |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   | nuse it is not directed SOLELY to  | issues which were n   | ewly   |  |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment( explanation of how the new or amended claims wo  |  |   | ns t   |  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to: 8,13 and 21.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,11,12 and 20</u> .  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approximately approximatel | oved or b) disapproved by th   | ne Examiner.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen  | t(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Other:  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | •  | WIPF 10/36/2004<br>William Phillip Fletche<br>Patent Examiner, USF<br>Group Art Unit 1762   | er III   |  |  |  |  |
|   |  | Oroup Art Orill 1702  |  |  |  |  |  |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 2. NOTE: Claim 1, if amended as-proposed, would add limitations not previously considered by the examiner (steps (c) and (d)). Further, a claim of this scope has not, heretofore, been considered by the examiner. Consequently, applicant's proposed amendment would require further search and consideration.

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the rejection set-forth in paragraph 4 of the action mailed 5/11/2004, in view of applicant's perfected priority.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments with respect to the rejections based on Cahalan and Stolowitz are drawn to the claims if amended as-proposed. Because applicant's proposed amendmet will not be entered, these arguments are not commensurate in scope with the claims.

WPF 10/26/2004

SHAWE P. BECK

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

THE STREET CENTER 1700